

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed July 25, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on February 20, 2004; October 11, 2005; October 30, 2006; May 8, 2007; and July 20, 2007.

Claims 1-9 and 11-27 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. Claims 1-8 and 15-19 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; claims 9, 11-14 and 20-27 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention; and new claims 63-88 have been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicant is entitled. The Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of claims 12-14 and 24-27 (Box 5, Office Action Summary, page 13, Paper No. 20080721). Accordingly, claims 9, 11-14, 20-27 and 63-88 are now pending in the present application, of which claims 9, 12, 20, 24, 63, 67, 71, 75, 79 and 85 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Official Action rejects claims 1, 4-6, 15 and 16 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0032210 to Takayama and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0146893 to Shimoda. The Official Action rejects claims 2 and 3 as obvious based on the combination of Takayama, Shimoda and U.S. Patent No. 6,703,267 to Tanabe. The Official Action rejects claims 7, 8, 18 and 19 as obvious based on the combination of Takayama, Shimoda and U.S. 6,885,032 to Forbes. The Official Action rejects claims 9, 11, 20, 21 and 23 as obvious based on the combination of Takayama, Shimoda, Forbes and U.S. Publication No. 2004/0256644 to Kugler. The Official Action rejects claim 17 as obvious based on the combination of Takayama, Shimoda and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0027247 to Arao. The Official Action rejects claim 22 as obvious

based on the combination of Takayama, Shimoda, Forbes, Kugler and Arao. The Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some reason, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some reason to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended. Independent claims 9 and 20 have been amended to recite a flexible integrated circuit capable of performing data transmission wirelessly, comprising a flexible substrate, among other features. These features are supported in the present specification, for example, by page 1, lines 9-14, which states that the present invention relates to a thin film integrated circuit device equipped with a thin film integrated circuit that is flexible; page 17, lines 6-12, which teaches contactless power supply and data transmission; page 12, line 3, which also teaches "wireless"; and page 9, lines 16-21, which discloses a flexible substrate. Also,

at this opportunity, the Applicant has amended allowed claims 12-14 and 24-27 to better recite the features of the present invention.

One feature of the present invention is to provide an integrated circuit capable of performing data transmission wirelessly (so called an RFID device) comprising an antenna and an integrated circuit that is manufactured by using a thin film transistor over a flexible substrate. Conventionally, the integrated circuit to be applied to an RFID device is manufactured by using a silicon wafer. However, the integrated circuit using the silicon wafer is thick and hard, which limits its usage due to designs and materials of the objects over which the RFID device is attached. On the other hand, when the integrated circuit for the RFID device is manufactured by using a thin film transistor over a flexible substrate as in the present invention, such limitations are relieved and the usage of the RFID device is expanded. Additionally, the RFID device can be manufactured at lower cost than in the case of using the silicon wafer.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Takayama, Shimoda, Forbes, Kugler and Arao, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-referenced features of the present independent claims.

Since Takayama, Shimoda, Forbes, Kugler and Arao do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

New claims 63-88 have been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicant is entitled. Claim 63 recites a flexible integrated circuit capable of performing data transmission wirelessly, which is supported in the present specification, for example, by page 1, lines 9-14, which states that the present invention relates to a thin film integrated circuit device equipped with a thin film integrated circuit that is flexible; page 17, lines 6-12, which teaches contactless power supply and data transmission; and page 12, line 3, which also teaches "wireless." Also, claim 63 recites an integrated circuit disposed over a substrate, the integrated circuit comprising thin film transistors,

which is supported in the present specification, for example, by page 12, line 23, to page 13, line 27. Further, claim 63 recites that the substrate has a flexibility, which is supported in the present specification, for example, by page 9, lines 16-21. For the reasons stated above, the Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 63-88 are in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789